DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 008 IR 050 879

AUTHOR Chen, Donna; Peterson, Lorna
TITLE Management by Objective and Its Formal Performance Appraisal: A Versatile Tool of Management.
PUB DATE 25 Jun 84
NOTE 17p.; A Poster Session Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Library Association Poster Session (103rd, Dallas, TX, June 23-28, 1984).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Libraries; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Librarians; *Management by Objectives; *Objectives; Organizational Objectives; *Performance Contracts; Personnel Evaluation; Records (Forms); Specifications

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the utility, versatility, and pros and cons of the formal performance appraisal as one of the tools of management by objectives (MBO). Rather than rating the traits of an employee, performance appraisal based on MBO rates an employee's achievements toward both his professional goals and institutional goals. The paper outlines the evolvement of performance appraisals as derived from MBO approaches at two college libraries: Ohio University Libraries, Athens, Ohio, and the Iowa State University Library, Ames, Iowa. Sample appraisal forms and guidelines are provided, and four advantages of performance appraisal are listed: (1) long range institutional goals and individual career growth are focused upon, thereby fostering a supportive relationship between the two; (2) achievements are enumerated periodically and problems are immediately identified and solutions attempted; (3) communication is enhanced and staff contribution encouraged in collective goal setting; and (4) objectivity is fostered by a concrete factual basis for appraisal. A selected bibliography is included. (Author/THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED250008

MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVE AND ITS FORMAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL: A VERSATILE TOOL OF MANAGEMENT

by

Donna Chen and Lorna Peterson

(A poster session paper presented at
the 103rd American Library Association
Annual Meeting, June 25, 1984)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donna Chen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR 050 879

ABSTRACT

Management by objective and its formal performance appraisal: a versatile tool of management. Donna Chen, Ohio University Libraries, Athens, OH. Lorna Peterson, Iowa State University, Parks Library, Ames, IA.

Management by objectives sets measurable goals for an institution or an individual to accomplish in a set time frame. One of its tools is a formal performance appraisal. Rather than rating the traits of an employee, performance appraisal based on MBO rates an employee's achievements toward his professional goals and institutional goals. At the Ohio University Libraries, Athens, Ohio and the Iowa State University Library, Ames, Iowa, performance appraisal has evolved from the MBO approach. Some of the advantages are: (1) Long range institutional goals and individual career growth are focused upon, thereby fostering a supportive relationship between the two; (2) Achievements are enumerated periodically and problems immediately identified while solutions attempted; (3) Communication is enhanced and staff contribution encouraged in collective goal setting; (4) Objectivity is fostered by a concrete factual basis for appraisal. This presentation shows the formal and informal evolvement of such an appraisal. Appraisal forms and guidelines are provided.

I. PROBLEM

Inadequacies of traditional performance appraisals:

---Appraising personality traits only.

---Lacking factual basis for rating and hence bearing no explicit relationship with performance.

---Lacking explicit relationship between an employee's and the institution's goals.

---Lacking provision for employee's input.

---Lacking weighting of criteria to reflect different job requirements for different jobs.

II. METHODOLOGY

A staff survey was conducted and improvements suggested were:

---Seek to remedy all above shortcomings.

---Retain old evaluative criteria but devise new procedures.

---Provide clearly defined library, departmental goals and objectives.

III. SOLUTION

A. New Appraisal Procedure

1. Goals and objectives are set by a library, its units and employees a year in advance.

2. Employee writes an annual report of accomplishments toward these goals and objectives, thus delineating parameters of appraisal.

3. Evaluation interview then occurs, during which one discusses one's performance of the past year with the rater.

4. The rater, following the interview, writes his observations and comments and the employee responds in writing.

5. A merit rating based on a fixed scale is given to represent the rater's overall judgement of the employee's performance as compared with the other employees in the library. As the following year's budget takes shape, the rating is translated into a specific percentage of salary raise.

6. The rater's superior(s) may review the comments and rating before or after the employee's response.

B. New Appraisal Form

1. The written report of accomplishments in the past year constitutes the base for evaluation.

2. Along with accomplishments, the report also includes problems encountered and steps taken towards their resolution.

3. Traditional criteria may be retained but are applied to ONLY a year's performance of an employee, NOT her/his personality.

4. To each criterion a weight is assigned to reflect the degree of its relevance to a particular position.

IV. PROS & CONS OF THE SOLUTION

CON:

TIME-CONSUMING

PROS:

1. Focus of appraisal shifts from personal characteristics to the organization's goals and the employee's professional growth.

2. Problems are quickly identified and their solutions attempted. Emphases are on solutions or approaches - candid discussions are thus more probable than discussions of the employee's abilities or lack of them.

3. Collective goal setting leads to enhanced communication, heightened employee contributions and easier long range planning.

4. Correctly used, the MBO approach fosters supportive relationship between the individual and the organization.

5. Since both the rater and the rated must form opinions based on facts, objectivity and equity are encouraged.

6. Salary raises are a clear representation of one's performance.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berkner, Dimity S. "Library staff development through performance appraisal," College and Research Libraries. 40,4:335-44, July 1979.

Encyclopedia of Professional Management. Bittel, Lester Robert and Bittle, Muriel A., eds. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Hilton, Robert C. "Performance evaluation of library personnel," Special Libraries, 69: 429-34, November 1978.

Iowa State University Library. Information and Policies Manual. Unpublished Document, 1982.

McConkey, Dale D. How to Manage by Results. 4th ed. New York, AMACOM, 1983.

Maloney, R. Kay, ed. Personnel Development in Libraries. New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University Graduate School of Library Science, 1976.

Michalko, James. "Management by objectives and the academic library." In Stragegies for Library Administration: Concepts and Approaches, by Charles R. Mc Clure and Alan R. Samuels. Littleton, CO., Libraries Unlimited, 1982.

Ohio University Libraries. Ohio University Libraries: Internal Policies and Procedures. Unpublished document, 1980.

Proceedings of Personnel Evaluation Institute. Frances M. Pollard, ed. Charleston, IL., Eastern Illinois University, Department of Library Science, 1976.

Rizzo, John R. Management for Librarians: Fundamentals and Issues. Westport, CT., Greenwood Press, 1980.

OHIO UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
CONTRACT EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Date: _____

Employee Name (last name first) S.S.# Dept. Position / / 6 months / / Annual / / Special

I. Bibliographer's duties: _____

_____

_____

Approximately _____% of time spent

II. Other duties as specified in the employee's job description, including special assignments:

_____

_____

_____

Approximately _____% of time spent

III. Using the scales below, write the numbers corresponding to your judgment of the importance of each criterion and the employee's rating in this area.

Importance	Rating
1. Unimportant	0. Not applicable
2. Somewhat important	1. Poor
3. Fairly important	2. Below average
4. Quite important	3. Average
5. Extremely important	4. Good
	5. Outstanding

Importance	Criterion	Rating
_____	Quality and quantity of work (accuracy, thoroughness, volume, speed) Comment _____	_____
_____	Knowledge of work and skills (awareness, aptitude) Comment _____	_____
_____	Adaptability (adjustment to change, ability to learn) Comment _____	_____
_____	Dependability (reliability) Comment _____	_____
_____	Judgment (ability to make decisions, plan individual work) Comment _____	_____
_____	Initiative and perception (motivation, interest in work) Comment _____	_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Importance	Criterion	Rating
_____	Cooperation and personal qualities (working with other employees and departments) Comment _____	_____
_____	Administrative/supervisory ability (organization, utilization, fair play) Comment _____	_____
_____	Service to library profession/University service Comment _____	_____
_____	Professional development (continuing education, research and publication, etc.) The applicability of this criterion depends on release time or additional staff provided. Comment _____	_____

Rater's comments. (In an essay-type statement the rater should sum up the total picture generated by the evaluation. See step 4 under Procedure for rating.) The rater should also sign the form in the space provided.

Recommended Merit Rating: _____

Signature Date

Reviewer's comments (In an essay-type statement the reviewer may reinforce the comments of the rater and/or add comments.) The reviewer should sign the rating form in the space provided.

Signature Date

Employee's acknowledgement and comments. (Signature indicates only that the employee has read the report and not necessarily that he/she agrees with its.)

Signature Date

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MERIT RATING SCALE

It was the consensus that there is no difficulty interpreting "high", "medium", or "low"--"high" or "3" level describes an outstanding employee in all characteristics listed on the performance evaluation, and then "2" and "1" moved downwards to medium and low.

Ambiguity arose with a "0" or "no" merit level. This rating is meant for the employee doing a satisfactory job, but only that. The employee, though competent and deserving of his/her position (and any salary such as cost-of-living raises) is merely plodding along. The "0" rating is also assigned to the new employee who has not been employed long enough to be evaluated.

It is presumed that the unsatisfactory employee is so evaluated on his/her annual performance evaluation and that termination of employment is recommended. The rater may also recommend that an unsatisfactory employee be given an opportunity to improve and extend a contract for one year, with the explicit proviso that the employee is on probationary notice that his/her performance must improve considerably to warrant a future contract.

A merit rating of "0" is <u>not</u>, therefore, meant to indicate an unsatisfactory or incompetent employee, and is <u>not</u> intended to imply that the employee should look elsewhere for employment.

EVALUATION OF LIBRARY FACULTY

I. Purposes

The Iowa State University Library has developed an evaluation program to assist the improvement of each faculty member's performance and thereby to enhance the quality of Library service. The evaluation process clarifies for faculty members and their supervisors how well they are carrying out their respective responsibilities and what is expected of them in the future.

Specific purposes of the evaluation program are:

To assist faculty in improving work performance and thereby patron service.
To assist faculty in better understanding the importance of their roles.
To assist faculty in identifying personal career goals and in integrating these with the objectives of the Library.
To encourage individual initiative and imagination.
To assist faculty in continuing professional development.
To develop a framework within which performance can be appraised.
To provide faculty with performance evaluation on a regular and systematic basis.
To foster improved communications between supervisors and staff.
To document the quality of performance as a major basis for merit salary increase recommendations.

II. Methodology

Frequency:

A formal evaluation of each faculty member who has been on the staff for a period of at least three months (as of December 31 of the year prior to the evaluation) will take place between February 1 through March 15 each year. All evaluations should be in the office of the Dean by March 15.

Formal evaluations of employees who begin duties between October 1 and March 31 should be held in the first month following the completion of six months of service.

Formal evaluations represent only the written aspect of the evaluation program for which supervisors and faculty are responsible. In addition, a continual, regular dialogue between supervisor and faculty member should be maintained throughout the year. The formal evaluation should contain no surprises as to judgment on performance but rather should serve to document what is already known. In cases of deficient performance, formal written evaluations should be completed as often as circumstances warrant.

Responsibility:

Performance evaluation is an administrative responsibility normally carried out by a faculty member's immediate supervisor. However, the evaluation process may include comments from both colleagues and subordinates and others with whom a faculty member interrelates. Furthermore, a major responsibility in the evaluation process rests upon the person evaluated. The faculty member should be a major source of factual information in areas such as continuing education, professional involvement, etc.

Preparation:

General success of the evaluation process is dependent upon the adequacy of preparation for it. Perhaps nothing is so important as a spirit of mutually frank and constructive criticism. There should also be an understanding of the purpose of evaluation and the process to be used.

Each person should have a current statement of "primary faculty responsibility" which should be agreed upon by the supervisor and the employee.

The evaluation should be based upon one's primary faculty assignment and any supplementary statement of plans or goals that may be utilized. Evaluation criteria have been developed to help the faculty member and the supervisor limit the evaluation to factors relevant to position effectiveness. Comments on personality, behavior, and similar matters are appropriate only when they relate to job performance. Greater emphasis should be given to performance of one's primary faculty responsibility than to other faculty activities in the evaluation process.

The Process:

By February 15 of each year each faculty member should have completed a statement of accomplishments which will include a report of significant activities in one's primary assignment, a statement of individual future plans and goals, and a report of professional, scholarly and service activities.

Between February 15 and March 15, supervisors should complete an evaluation of faculty who report to them. This evaluation should be based on the faculty member's "statement of accomplishments" and made in consultation with the appropriate department head, assistant director, or the Dean.

The faculty member should be given the evaluation at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled evaluation meeting.

The evaluation meeting should be used to discuss all aspects of the faculty member's performance, and differences of opinion concerning the written evaluation provided to the faculty member should be resolved. The faculty member should also comment on the supervisor's performance and other factors that affect the faculty member's own performance.

Individual plans and goals are developed as a joint responsibility of the faculty member and the supervisor. Whereas the faculty member is asked to provide a draft statement, clear guidance should be provided by the supervisor in order to ensure that goals and plans are realistic and consistent with overall Library objectives. Necessary changes in the goals statement should be made during the evaluation meeting or as soon thereafter as possible.

If no changes need to be made in the evaluation document prepared by the supervisor, both the supervisor and the faculty member sign two copies of the statement. If the evaluation draft requires changes, revision should be made immediately, within 24 hours if at all possible, and then the two copies signed. Regardless of whether the evaluation is changed, a faculty member may have up to three working days to consider the final draft of the evaluation statement, prepare a statement of disagreement (Part III) or clarification which will be attached to the evaluation statement, and sign the documents.

Signature of the evaluation statement by the faculty member evaluated is an acknowledgement that the evaluation statement has been received and discussed; it does not imply that the faculty member agrees with the document.

Once the two copies of the final evaluation statement are signed, they are forwarded to the next administrative review level. Both signed copies are returned, one to the faculty member evaluated, and one forwarded to the Dean's Office for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file.

Access to Evaluation Statements:

Annual evaluations are retained as part of a faculty member's personnel file. Access to the evaluation is restricted to the Dean of Library Services, the assistant directors, the faculty member's department head, any other immediate supervisor, and the faculty member. Although the evaluations in a faculty member's personnel file may be used as a source of information for writing letters of recommendation, they are not to be copied and distributed in lieu of such letters.

Confidentiality:

The supervisor conducting the evaluation and all those who may have access to the final written evaluation shall hold all information and materials concerning the faculty member as confidential. Infringements upon this policy should be immediately reported to the Dean of Library Services.

Adopted 11/10/77
Revised 1/20/82

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

NAME _____

RANK _____

TENURE DATE _____

APPT. RENEWAL DATE _____

SUPERVISOR _____

(Information contained in this form will be used in merit considerations.)

PART I

Annual Statement of Accomplishments from the last evaluation to current date.
(To be completed by the faculty member and given to his/her supervisor by February 15.)

A. Primary Faculty Assignment
(Please report your activities in the area of your primary faculty assignment making note of new developments, special projects, or creative advances for which you have been responsible.)

B. Scholarship
(See ISU Library Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for scholarship. Include research planned or in progress.)

C. Service and Professional Activities
(See ISU Library Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for service and professional activities.)

D. Statement of Individual Goals and Plans
(The following statement may cover areas such as primary faculty responsibility, scholarship, and service.)

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

NAME _____ SUPERVISOR _____

RANK _____ (Information contained in this form will be used in merit considerations.)

TENURE DATE _____

APPT. RENEWAL DATE _____

PART II

(To be completed by the supervisor by March 15.)

A. Performance Evaluation

(Comments should be related to: the quality and quantity of work; ability to organize work activity and use time efficiently; thoroughness; sense of responsibility in all major areas of work assignment; ability to perceive problems and concerns and initiate creative solutions; application of professional knowledge to practical service concerns; self-motivation and independence; judgment; flexibility in adapting to change in order to improve service; acceptance of and response to criticism as well as the ability to give constructive criticism to colleagues, superiors, and subordinates; ability to communicate and relate to students, faculty and colleagues; ability to support the overall goals of the Library. For faculty members in supervisory roles, comment on: leadership; ability to organize general work flow and special projects; train; give clear instructions; communicate with staff; motivate performance; delegate authority, handle problem situations; provide impartial treatment of staff; and evaluate personnel. The evaluation process may include comments from both colleagues and subordinates and others with whom a faculty member interrelates.)

B. Summary and Salary Recommendations

(Note the main strengths and weaknesses in overall performance and assess prospects for advancement as they relate to both Library and University criteria for promotion and tenure. Comment on the faculty member's potential for career advancement and specify improvements and additional achievements which would be important in obtaining promotions, tenure, merit increases, and appointment renewals.)

Signature - Supervisor

Signature - Faculty Member

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

NAME _____ SUPERVISOR _____

RANK _____ (Information contained in this form will be used in merit considerations.)

TENURE DATE _____

APPT. RENEWAL DATE _____

PART III

Comments by the Faculty Member